



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,327	05/15/2002	Jay M Mcythaler	UAB-15102/22	3596
25006	7590	05/05/2004	EXAMINER	
GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, PC 280 N OLD WOODARD AVE SUITE 400 BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			TRAVERS, RUSSELL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/049,327	MEYTHALER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Russell Travers, J.D., Ph.D	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-7 and 29-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The amendment filed December 31, 2003 election filed September 4, 2003 has been received and entered into the file.

Applicant's arguments filed December 31, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Claims 1 and 4-41 are presented for examination.

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-7 and 29-35 in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged.

Claims 8-28, reading on non-elected subject matter are withdrawn from consideration.

This application contains claims 89-28 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that defines those "derivative" compounds which are useful for practicing the invention as claimed. Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of "derivative" compound examples are set forth, thereby failing to provide sufficient working

Art Unit: 1617

examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all "derivative" compounds which are useful for practicing the invention as claimed, necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 36 is rendered indefinite by the "derivative" and thereby failing to clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Criteria defining medicaments that are "derivative" compounds which are useful for practicing the invention as claimed are not set forth in the specification, thereby failing to provide information defining the instant inventions metes and bounds. Applicant's term fails to clearly define the subject matter encompassed by the instant claims, thus is properly rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApl's 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence or absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that defines those maladies residing under the penumbra of "acquired disorders" envisioned as practiced in the invention as claimed. Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of "acquired disorders" examples are set forth, thereby failing to

Art Unit: 1617

provide sufficient working examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all "Acquired disorders", necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 35 is rendered indefinite by the phrase "acquired disorders" and thereby failing to clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Criteria defining diseases residing under the penumbra of "acquired disorders" which are useful for practicing the invention as claimed are not set forth in the specification, thereby failing to provide information defining the instant inventions metes and bounds. Applicant's term fails to clearly define the subject matter encompassed by the instant claims, thus is properly rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Grilli et al.

Examiner notes the claims read on analogs, pro-drugs and associated forms. Additionally, Grilli et al teach "the pharmaceutically acceptable salts" (see claim 1) to include those choline salts herein recited. The recited salts would be disassociated in-vivo, and, thus, been inherently employed for the use herein claimed.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude

patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1, 4-7 and 29-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Grilli et al, in view of the Merck Index, Jurna et al and Sakanashi et al.

Grilli et al teach the claimed non-steroidal anti-inflammatory compounds (NSAID's) as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. These medicament are taught as useful for treating inflammation, and those maladies herein recited (see abstract and specification, especially pages 1-6) viewed by the skilled artisan as immuno-suppressive. Claims 1, 4-7, 31-35 and 41, and the primary reference, differ as to:

- 1) specific recitation of the claimed medicament, and
- 2) administration of these conventional medicaments by these routes.

This deficiency is cured by the Merck Index teaching Choline salicylate as an old and well known NSAID. Possessing the Grilli et al teaching of Parkinson's disease and Alzheimer's disease therapy with NSAID compounds, the skilled artisan would have been motivated to employ those NSAID compounds taught by the Merck Index for these conditions and enjoyed a reasonable expectation of therapeutic success, absent information to the contrary. Attention is directed to Grilli et al page 6, lines 14 and 16 teaching the instant compounds as useful for treat "cranial and spinal traumas", seen by the skilled artisan as indistinguishable from that use herein envisioned.

Jurna et al and Sakanashi et al teach non-steroidal anti-inflammatory compounds (NSAID's) as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. These medicament are taught as useful for treating various maladies by administration via the interthecal and by inter-coronary injection.

Claims 1, 4-7 and 29-41 specifically requires administration of the claimed NSAID compounds by interthecal and inter-coronary injection. Jurna et al and Sakanashi et al employed NSAID compounds by the interthecal and inter-coronary modes, not specifically reciting another formulation, or mode of administration. The skilled artisan would have seen interthecal and inter-coronary administration of NSAID compounds by interthecal and inter-coronary routes as residing in the skilled artisan purview.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Examiner finds the presented rebuttal arguments unconvincing. A "derivative" would be a compound modified from the original form. Absent information with regard to how such modifications are undertaken, the skilled artisan would not possess such compounds absent undue experimentation. Additionally an "acquired disorder" as stated by Applicants; would be any malady that might befall an individual. Absent guidance the skilled artisan would not identify those conditions envisioned herein absent undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *General Electric Company v. Wabash Appliance Corporation et al* 37 USPQ 466 (US 1938), at 469, speaking to functional language at the point of novelty as herein employed: "the vice of a functional claim

Art Unit: 1617

exists not only when a claims is “wholly” functional, if that is ever true, but when the inventor is painstaking when he recites what has already been seen, and then uses conveniently functional language at the exact point of novelty”. Functional language at the point of novelty, as herein employed by Applicants, is further admonished in *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* 43 USPQ2d 1398 (CAFC 1997) at 1406: stating this usage does “little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the recited invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate”.

Applicants functional language at the point of novelty fails to meet the requirements set forth under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claims employing functional language at the point of novelty, such as Applicants', neither provide those elements required to practice the inventions, nor “inform the public during the life of the patent of the limits of the monopoly asserted” *General Electric Company v. Wabash Appliance Corporation et supra*, at 468. Claims thus constructed provide no guidance as to medicaments employed, levels for providing therapeutic benefit, or provide notice for those practicing in the art, limits of protection. Simply stated, the presented claims are an invitation to experiment, not reciting a specific medicament regimen useful for practicing the instant invention.

The anticipation rejection has been withdrawn, rendering the rebuttal arguments moot.

Examiner notes the invention of Grilli et al reads on employment of “salts” as herein envisioned (see claim 1). Choline salicylate is an old and well known salt of those compounds recited by Grilli et al. The skilled artisan, possessing a compound for

Art Unit: 1617

an old and well known therapeutic use possesses that compounds isomers, analogs, homologs, bioisosteres for the same use. Attention is directed to *In re Ward* 141 USPQ 227 (CCPA 1964) and *Galaxo Operations U.K. Ltd. V. Quigg* 13 USPQ2d 1628, setting forth guidelines regarding therapeutic compounds relationships. Those compounds taught as obvious over the therapeutic compound are acids, ethers, esters and all salts. In the instant case, Applicants attempt to capture these obvious variants of the old and well known therapeutic compounds. Absent an illustration of unexpected benefits residing in the specific compounds herein claimed, the instant claims remain properly rejected under 35 USC 103.

Determining the active ingredient dosage level required to effect optimal therapeutic benefit is well within the Skilled Artisan's purview and the benefits of achieving such maximization obvious, to said skilled artisan. The claims merely recite the obvious employment of old and well known active ingredients, carriers and excipients. Absent information to the contrary, the skilled artisan would have seen the selection of one or another conventional administration route as the simple selection between obvious alternatives. Possessing the examiner cited teachings, the skilled artisan would have been motivated to employ the claimed active ingredients to treat neuro-pathologies, in the manner recited in the instant claims, absent information to the contrary.

It is noted that the prior art teaches the therapeutic aim herein claimed, for the compounds recited by Applicants. Applicants attempt to distance the claimed invention from the cited prior art by claiming salts, esters, acids and other conventional

Art Unit: 1617

medicament forms is not successful. Absent unexpected benefits residing in the claimed compounds, the instant claims remain properly rejected under 35 USC 103.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell Travers, J.D., Ph.D whose telephone number is 571-272-0631. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:00 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax

Art Unit: 1617

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RT', enclosed within a large, loopy oval stroke.

Russell Travers, J.D, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617